

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEW TYPE-SPECIES
OF *DENDROBATES* WAGLER, 1830. Z.N.(S.) 1930
(see volume 27, pages 262-264)

By Charles W. Myers (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York*
10024, U.S.A.) and John W. Daly (*National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland*
20014, U.S.A.)

We agree with Dr. Silverstone's contention that the generic names *Dendrobates* and *Phyllobates* should continue to be used in the traditional sense. However, to arbitrarily suppress one type-species and designate a new one is a serious step that should be considered only when there is some assurance that the nomenclature will be stabilized. Such assurance is presently lacking in the case of the Neotropical arrow-poison frogs and their relatives (Dendrobatidae), despite Dr. Silverstone's claim of "clear" morphological and chromosomal evidence. Generic limits in the Dendrobatidae have not been established with confidence, and Dr. Silverstone's application is based on a subjective taxonomic conclusion, for which no supporting data have been published by him or anyone else at the time of this writing (August, 1971). Indeed, our own field observations and analyses of toxic skin secretions seem to be at variance with one of the generic reassignments proposed in the application, and there should be opportunity to resolve such biological problems before type-species are reshuffled by fiat. Also, we should like to know what actions have been taken to verify the identity of *Calamita tinctoria* Schneider, 1799, which Dr. Silverstone proposes as the new type-species of *Dendrobates*. Although currently applied to a distinctive Guianan species, the name *Dendrobates tinctorius* has had an unstable and rather complex history, as commented on in part by Boulenger (*Proc. zool. Soc. London*, 1913 : 1026-1027). It would also be useful to know the proper identity of the type-species of *Phyllobates*, namely *P. bicolor* Bibron "1855" [1840?]; the type locality was erroneously indicated as Cuba and the name is currently applied to at least two different species of South American frogs.

As concerned workers in the field of dendrobatid systematics, we recommend that the application be rejected without prejudice, for possible reconsideration when supposed generic distinctions are adequately documented. This will not necessitate the confusing name changes mentioned in the application, because we need only treat the presently recognized genera tentatively as if they were "collective groups" (Art. 42(c)), permitting us to ignore the type-species requirement for the present.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF
OKENIA MENKE, 1830, AND *IDALIELLA* BERGH, 1881. Z.N.(S.) 1931
(see volume 27, pages 265-266)

By Robert Burn (3 Nantes Street, Newtown, Geelong, Victoria 3220, Australia)

As a descriptor of Australian species of *Okenia*, I wish to place on record my wholehearted support for Dr. Henning Lemche's proposed addition of this genus and *Idaliella* to the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology. However, with regard to the taxon *Idaliella* Bergh, 1881, one subjective comment is considered necessary.

Lemche, in his proposal, calls *Idaliella* the "closely related genus" (to *Okenia*), whereas, except for Vogel & Schultz (1970, *Veliger* 12 : 389), all taxonomists and compilers of systematic lists have regarded *Idaliella* as a subgenus of *Okenia*. The careful analysis of two Brazilian species by the late Ernst Marcus (1957, *J. Linn. Soc. Lond.*, *Zool.* 43 : 436, 440) indicates that except for "centre of back with (*Okenia* s. str.) and without (*Idaliella*) filaments", the anatomy provides no characteristics that might with certainty distinguish subgeneric groups or generic groups within *Okenia* s.l. In fact some species attributed to *Okenia* s. str. have such incipient filaments or tubercles

on the centre of the back, that it is difficult to decide whether they ought not to be assigned to *Idaliella*, for example, see *O. sapelona* Marcus & Marcus (1967, *Malacologia* 6 : 203).

One might therefore question the need for this apparent arbitrary division of species of *Okenia*, and therewith the necessity of protection for the name *Idaliella*, which in my opinion is nothing more than a junior subjective synonym of *Okenia*.

By proper reference to Article 11d, Lemche also quite correctly reduces the substitute name *Cargoa* Vogel & Schultz (1970, *Veliger* 12 : 388) to a junior subjective synonym of *Okenia*. One might also draw attention to the fact that the type species of *Cargoa*, *C. cupella* Vogel & Schultz (*loc. cit.* : 390) from Virginia, U.S.A., appears to be described from small specimens of *Okenia impexa* Marcus (1957, *J. Linn. Soc. Lond.*, **Zool.** 43 : 434) from São Paulo, Brazil, Beaufort, North Carolina, U.S.A. and Mayagüez, Puerto Rico (Marcus & Marcus, 1970 : *Stud. Fauna Curaçao* 33: 74), and as such is a junior synonym of the latter.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PRESERVATION OF CYMATIIDAE IREDALE, 1913. Z.N.(S.) 1939 (see volume 28, pages 59-61)

By Jørgen Knudsen & Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

The genus *Ranella* is a well-known one and is already in use as a basis for the subfamily name RANELLINAE, which is the oldest family-group name for those genera now comprising the family CYMATIIDAE. The proposal by Drs. Cernohorsky and Beu simply asks the Commission to prevent the RANELLINAE from becoming the nominotypical subfamily of the group now illegally called the CYMATIIDAE. However, quite an intricate pattern of special procedures are necessary to obtain this goal, as there are many other names available which are older than CYMATIIDAE Iredale, 1913. The inconveniences involved in having to consider special opinions every time taxonomic problems turn up and revisions are to be made are such that they will far outweigh the inconvenience of shifting the name CYMATIIDAE out and replacing it with the well-known name RANELLIDAE.

By T. Jaczewski (*Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw*)

I would like to draw attention to the fact that there is in use in zoology a homonymous family-group name CYMATIINAE Hungerford, 1948, in the Insecta, Heteroptera, family CORIXIDAE (1948, *Univ. Kansas Sci. Bull.* 32 : 99). Although the name CYMATIINAE Hungerford, 1948, is a junior homonym of CYMATIIDAE Iredale, 1913, the case becomes complicated by the fact that the taxon CYMATIINAE Hungerford includes only one genus, *Cymatia* Flor, 1860, which has no synonymic names nor ever had any. I think therefore that the applicants should be asked to reconsider the matter as they have in the Gastropod family in question at least two other generic names (*Ranella* Lamarck, 1816, and *Septa* Perry, 1810) from which family-group names could be derived.

In case the applicants agree with my opinion, I should like to add to their application the following points:

- (3) (d) *Cymatia* Flor, 1860 (gender : feminine), type-species, by designation by Kirkaldy, 1898, *Sigara coleoptrata* Fabricius, 1776;
- (4) (d) *coleoptrata* Fabricius, 1776, as published in the binomen *Sigara coleoptrata* (type-species of *Cymatia* Flor, 1860);

Replacement of (2) (a) CYMATIINAE Hungerford, 1948 (type-genus *Cymatia* Flor, 1860).